UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,016	11/21/2003	Raymond V. Damadian	DAMADIAN 3.0-080	5664
	7590 04/04/200 VID, LITTENBERG,	EXAMINER		
KRUMHOLZ &	& MENTLIK	CHENG, JACQUELINE		
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3768	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/721,016	DAMADIAN, RAYMOND V.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	JACQUELINE CHENG	3768				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period variety reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 Ja</u>	anuary 2008					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	action is non-final.					
	'					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-16 and 20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6, 8-16, 20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	·					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Art Unit: 3737

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-5, 8-11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (US 2003/0126279 A1) further in view of White (US 2004/0019501 A1).
- 4. Claims 1-5 and 8-10: To have multiple MRI scanners at one facility is well known in the art. It would be obvious to have multiple scanners in order to be able to process twice or three times as many patients in a same time frame, enhancing patient throughput. Hu discloses that a large hospital may have as many as four MRI imagers (paragraph 0013). Although Hu does not explicitly disclose the type of scanners that are in the hospital, it is obvious to one skilled in the art to have any numerations of variety in the scanners. It is possible to have four of the same scanners, although it is more likely to have various scanners with different purposes such as a full body MRI scanner, an open MRI scanner, and an extremity scanner to be able to address a more wide area of problems within the hospital. Although Hu does not explicitly disclose a

Art Unit: 3737

system for directing patients to the proper scanner, it would also be obvious to one skilled in the art that the hospital's imaging center will have a list of patients who have scheduled an appointment. The patients are received and directed to the scanner they are scheduled for and the area of interest (such as a patient's head or foot) is scanned. It would be obvious to want to make this process a smoother and more efficient process such as by implementing a patient scheduling system such as the one disclosed by White (paragraph 0008 of White). White discloses a method of using a computer system which maintains many different types of queues. There is a receptionist queue which maintains a list of received patients (paragraph 0046-0048) and a technologist queue which is used to direct the received patients to the proper scanner (paragraph 0036, 0052, 0053) such as either the full body MRI scanner or the extremity scanner.

5. Claims 1 and 8: Although it would be obvious to have an extremity scanner and a MRI scanner in a same facility (for further support see Emory-Adventist Hospital,

http://www.emoryadventist.org/ImagingServices.aspx, who offers both a standard whole-body scanner as well as an extremity scanner on the same campus (or facility) and SportsMed clinic,

http://www.sportsmedlink.com/about_mri.html, who offers both lower extremity MRI and full body open MRI), the applicant's claim does not require the second scanner to be limited to a scanner being small enough to only allow an extremity of the patient. The applicant claims in claim 1 and 8 "the second scanner being large enough to allow only an extremity or the head of a patient". A full body scanner is large enough to allow only an extremity or the head of the patient.

Art Unit: 3737

6. **Claims 11 and 15:** A magnetic imaging apparatus with a magnet defining a horizontal field axis and an imaging volume surrounding the axis having a vertical and horizontal direction is inherent in any MR system.

7. Claims 6, 12-14, 16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu in view of White in as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Damadian'490 (US 6,414,490 B1). Damadian'490 et al. discloses an MRI that can position a patient through a range of orientations from a horizontal to a vertical position (abstract). The positioning device also has a variety of retractable pieces to orientate the patient in any desired orientation relative to the frame, such as in a seated position or a standing position with a footrest to orient the patient in a weight bearing position (col. 5 line 17-25). The device also has the ability to move the patient upwardly and downwardly to allow scanning of essentially any part of the patient (such as the foot) (col. 6 line 8-15). This mobility is achieved by the use of an elevator. Although the device has the ability to move the patient in a range of up to five or six feet, if the area of interest to be imaged is a head or chest, then the support is limited to a range of motion less than 1.5 feet. It would be obvious to combine Damadian'490 with Hu as any well known MRI imaging system can be housed in a hospital.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 2002/0099571 A1 to Waku.

Art Unit: 3737

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JACQUELINE CHENG whose telephone number is (571)272-

5596. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00-6:30.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian L Casler/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit

3737

/Jacqueline Cheng/ Examiner, Art Unit 3768